

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 30 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Applicant: Kimble)	Art Unit: 2174
)	
Serial No.: 09/775,692)	Examiner: Ke
)	
Filed: February 2, 2001)	50N3463.01
)	
For: WEB BROWSER PLUG IN FOR TV)	January 26, 2006
)	750 B STREET, Suite 3120
)	San Diego, CA 92101
)	

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTIONCommissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA

Dear Sir:

This response to the Office Action dated May 2, 2005 is accompanied by the requisite petition to revive, extension fees, and revival fees.

Reconsideration of the above-captioned application is respectfully requested. All currently pending claims except for Claim 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Anderson et al., USPN 6,219,042, and Claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. in view of Houghton et al., USPN 6,757,707. The rejections are traversed for the following reasons.

Anderson et al., col. 1, line 56 through col. 2, line 21 has been used as a teaching of displaying a video content frame within a Web browser content frame in a windowless environment. This allegation is incorrect. The relied-upon portion of Anderson et al. simply discusses toggling between a TV mode and an Internet mode

1168-176.AMD